

REMARKS

In view of both the amendments presented above and the following discussion, the Applicant submits that none of the claims now pending in the application is anticipated under the provisions of 35 USC § 102. Thus, the Applicant believes that all of these claims are now in allowable form.

If, however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues requiring adverse final action in any of the claims now pending in the application, the Examiner should telephone Mr. Peter L. Michaelson, Esq. at (732) 530-6671 so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Specification and abstract amendments

Various amendments have been made to the specification and abstract to correct minor inadvertent spelling, grammatical, punctuation and formal errors.

Further, the Examiner is apparently unable to locate the proper insertion point in the specification for an amendment, specifically insertion of a section heading, made by the Applicant's immediately prior amendment to page 1, between lines 5 and 6. The Examiner may have been referring to a version of the specification with differing line numbers than that to which the Applicant has referred in his prior amendment. Accordingly, to facilitate proper entry of all the specification amendments, the Applicant has now included herewith both a marked-up specification showing all the Applicant's changes, both those previously made and

Appl. No. 09/600,982  
Amdt. dated Dec. 2, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of Sept. 6, 2005

those now made, and a substitute specification which incorporates all those changes. The substitute specification contains no new matter.

#### Status of claims

To simplify consideration and entry of the claim amendments, the Applicant, rather than re-writing his claims -- particularly in light of the number of separate changes that would otherwise have needed to be made to those claims -- has simply canceled his existing claims and replaced them with new claims 15-24. To prevent confusion, the Applicant has not reused claim number 14 even though previous claims 13 and 14 were simply re-numbered as claims 12 and 13, respectively.

New independent claims 15 and 20 contain substantive limitations similar to those in claims 3 and 4, and 9 and 10, respectively, though couched in phraseology consistent with US claim practice and proper idiomatic usage.

New dependent claims 16-19 and 21-24 respectively and generally correspond to now canceled dependent claims 5-8; and 11-13 and 2.

#### Rejection under 35 USC § 102(e)

The Examiner has rejected claims 3 and 9 under the provisions of 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by the teachings in the Forrest patent (United States patent 6,084,875 issued to A. G. Forrest on July 4, 2000).

Appl. No. 09/600,982  
Amdt. dated Dec. 2, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of Sept. 6, 2005

Inasmuch as these claims were now canceled and not replaced with corresponding independent claims, this rejection is moot. In light of the nature of new independent claims 15 and 20 presented and described herein, no further comments are deemed necessary in response to this rejection.

### Objection

The Examiner has objected to claims 4 and 10 as being dependent on a rejected based claim. However, the Examiner has indicated that both of these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all limitations of the base and any intervening claims. the Examiner has similarly objected to dependent claims 5-8, and 2 and 11-13 as depending from objected claims 4 and 10, respectively.

In response, the Applicant is now presenting new independent claims 15 and 20 which contain substantive limitations similar to those in claims 3 and 4, and 9 and 10, respectively.

Accordingly, new claims 15 and 20 should now be allowable, as would be claims 16-19 and 21-24 which respectively depend there from.

### Conclusion

Thus, the Applicant submits that none of the claims, presently in the application, is anticipated under the provisions of 35 USC § 102.

Appl. No. 09/600,982  
Amdt. dated Dec. 2, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of Sept. 6, 2005

Consequently, the Applicant believes that all those claims are presently in condition for allowance. Accordingly, both reconsideration of this application and its swift passage to issue are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

December 2, 2005



Peter L. Michaelson, Attorney  
Reg. No. 30,090  
Customer No. 007265  
(732) 530-6671

MICHAELSON & ASSOCIATES  
Counselors at Law  
Parkway 109 Office Center  
328 Newman Springs Road  
P.O. Box 8489  
Red Bank, New Jersey 07701

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING under 37 C.F.R. 1.8(a)

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited on **December 5, 2005** with the United States Postal Service as first class mail, with sufficient postage, in an envelope addressed to the Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.



Signature



Reg. No.

(PTT98RCEAMEND/ca:163)